

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants kindly thank the Examiner for his indication of allowable subject matter as to Claims 1-17. In response to the Office Action dated February 17, the applicants have amended Claims 1, 2, 14, and 18-20 and Claim 21 has been added. Entry of the above amendments and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and comments made herein is requested.

Objections to the Specification:

The Specification has been objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the Claims 1 and 3.

As to **Claim 1**, the Specification is objected to as not providing support for: "applying a second reference voltage having a value different from the first reference voltage to the first input of the first monitor cell". The applicants believe support for this claim language can be found throughout the Specification. For example, in the Summary at page 5 at line 22 through page 6 at line 5 (abbreviated hereinafter as 5:22-6:5). Further examples of such support can be found at 11:5-10 or 13:11-22 and elsewhere in the Specification. Accordingly, the applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

As to **Claim 3**, the Specification is objected to on two grounds. In a first objection the Specification is cited as lacking support for: "applying sequentially the first reference voltage and the second reference voltage to a first input of a second of the at least one monitor cells". The applicants believe support for this claim language can be found throughout the Specification. For example, the several iterations language at 18:14-19:6. Further examples of such support are found at 13:11-14:3 and elsewhere in the Specification. Accordingly, the applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

Again as to **Claim 3**, the Specification is also objected to as lacking support for: "applying a second test voltage from a second selected portion of the chip to a second input of the second monitor cell". The applicants believe support for this claim language can be found throughout the Specification. For example, in reference to Fig. 2 (e.g., selected portions 211-213) and the supporting portions of the specification. For example, support can be found at 16:10-17:19, as well as elsewhere in the Specification. Accordingly, the applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

The applicant's respectfully submit that, to the extent that the above explanation is insufficient to overcome the objections, the Specification will be amended to put any such claim language directly into the Specification.

Objections to the Claims:

Claims 2, 14, and 18 have been objected as containing a variety of informalities. The applicants have appropriately corrected these informalities. Accordingly, the applicants request withdrawal of these objections.

As to Claim 20 which is objected to as lacking antecedent basis for "the latches" the applicants offer the following explanation. Claim 20 is dependent on Claim 18 which has been substantially amended and includes a "monitor cell ... comprising a first digital voltage comparator and a second digital voltage comparator each of the comparators coupled respectively to an associated latch for receiving the output of the voltage comparator". Accordingly, each of the two comparators is coupled to an associated latch (i.e., one latch each). Therefore, Claim 18 inherently provides antecedent basis for "the associated latches" of Claim 20 (as now amended). Consequently, the applicants believe there is no antecedent basis issue with respect to Claim 18. However, the applicants are open to any language changes that the Examiner may suggest in relation to this issue.

Accordingly, the applicants request that these claim objections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 18-20 stand rejected as being anticipated by *Yoshikawa* (USPN 4,713,819). These rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the claims as amended herein.

Claim 18 has been significantly amended to now include the limitations of more than one latch and:

"inputs to the first comparator comprise a supply voltage from one of the plurality of supply conductors and an overvoltage reference voltage; and
inputs to the second comparator comprise the supply voltage from the one of the plurality of supply conductors and an undervoltage reference voltage."

These limitations are not present in the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the invention, as now claimed in Claim 18, is not anticipated by the cited art. Therefore, it is respectfully suggested that the outstanding rejections of Claim 18 (and dependent Claims 19-21) should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

New Claim 21

Claim 21 is dependent on Claim 18 and includes a further limitation of having latches with a "timer configured to timestamp occurrences of overvoltage incidents and undervoltage incidents" which is believed to further define over the cited art.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record and that this case is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns regarding the present application, he is invited to contact the undersigned at a time convenient to the Examiner using one of the telephone numbers set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Francis T. Kafinski II
Registration No. 44,177

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
Telephone: (831) 642-9609